

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/753,491	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HALNA DU FRETAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL C. LAI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2457	

**All Participants:**

(1) MICHAEL C. LAI.

(2) Daniel S. Glueck.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 17 December 2009

**Time:** 3pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*none*

**Claims discussed:**

*60,29,32-44,58*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*We discussed examiner's proposed amendment to allow the case. We agreed upon not to insert the phrase "of the payload information" after "start" in claim 60, line 21, as there is support in Fig. 8 for the limitation. We tried to fix "means for" issues but couldn't reach agreement. Applicant's representative needs more time to fully understand the 112 6<sup>th</sup> requirements. As a result, the prosecution continued.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)